

JESSED
EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOONA. W. SHURT, J. W. SHANKLIN,
Editors and Publishers.

REPUBLICAN COUNTY TICKET.

John F. Swift's standing as an honest and honorable citizen has been violently assailed by the Democratic press. Nothing has been considered too preposterous or mean to be said at his door. Proofs have been lacking, but that made no sort of difference in the amount and character of the slanders heaped upon him. The charges have been rung over every grade of crime from the grabbing of a \$2,000 fee to the robbing of a poor step mother and half brothers of a pauper hundred dollars. That these charges have all been conscientiously and fairly disproven check but does not stop the muddy current of slander. The tide has set so strong in that direction that the power which set it in motion is impotent to stop it now if it would.

The attitude and conduct of Republicans toward Democratic nominees have been in marked contrast to the Democratic methods. The official conduct of Washington Bartlett is more open to the charge of dishonesty than is any act of Mr. Swift's public or private career that has been described in various terms of "robbers," "lascivious" and "corrupt robbery," and yet, we are most heavily glad to say no Republican newspaper or speaker, to our knowledge, has used any appropriate name in connection with Mr. Bartlett's acts. No mention we have made of his private affairs, and all criticism of his public record has been made in a legitimate and decent manner and with a proper regard for his standing as a public man and a gentleman.

Mr. Bartlett was at one time a member of the City Hall Commission of San Francisco, and we believe he held at the same time the position of Mayor. At this time this commission was practically useful solely in the matter of dispensing salaries may be seen from the fact that during the entire year \$48,000 was paid out for work on the building and \$4,700.00 was paid as salaries. That Mr. Bartlett as a member of that commission drew this unearned salary up to late date as January last is an undisputed fact. Yet Mr. Bartlett was legally entitled to this salary, and while it furnishes legitimate ground for criticism, it does not furnish grounds for abusing him as a thief, or for saying that the act was necessarily that of an utterly disreputable man. We do not think he was justified in drawing a salary without having rendered an equivalent for it, but Mr. Bartlett may look at the matter in another light.

John F. Swift has also been employed to transact business for the City of San Francisco. He was given a contract by the Board of Supervisors to conduct a case against the Spring Valley Water Company. The terms of the contract were that if he did not win the case, he was to receive nothing for his work. He fought the case in the courts for seven years, and when the Legislature legalized the payment of his fee by the city a Democrat had now taken it. They have represented their situation to the railroad company, and according to the Chronicle, that corporation has under consideration a plan to abolish all terminal shipping points except San Francisco and Los Angeles. Past experience certainly did not justify us in expecting anything of a road or liberal character from the men who will propose this, but we were hardly prepared for an action so shameful and contemptible as this. There are now but seven terminal points in the state, which are a number less than the business interests of the state demand, and a proposition that this number, in addition to a few small-minded and cowardly tradesmen, be decreased to two, is beyond all precedent for wanton impiety in the history of any country. We do not know what sort of a railroad company, but we do know that if either the railroad company or the promoters of this movement have the slightest regard for public opinion there will be no attempt made to carry out this repulsive and illegitimate undertaking.

IN REGARD TO HONESTY.

John F. Swift's standing as an honest and honorable citizen has been violently assailed by the Democratic press. Nothing has been considered too preposterous or mean to be said at his door. Proofs have been lacking, but that made no sort of difference in the amount and character of the slanders heaped upon him. The charges have been rung over every grade of crime from the grabbing of a \$2,000 fee to the robbing of a poor step mother and half brothers of a pauper hundred dollars. That these charges have all been conscientiously and fairly disproven check but does not stop the muddy current of slander. The tide has set so strong in that direction that the power which set it in motion is impotent to stop it now if it would.

The attitude and conduct of Republicans toward Democratic nominees have been in marked contrast to the Democratic methods. The official conduct of Washington Bartlett is more open to the charge of dishonesty than is any act of Mr. Swift's public or private career that has been described in various terms of "robbers," "lascivious" and "corrupt robbery," and yet, we are most heavily glad to say no Republican newspaper or speaker, to our knowledge, has used any appropriate name in connection with Mr. Bartlett's acts. No mention we have made of his private affairs, and all criticism of his public record has been made in a legitimate and decent manner and with a proper regard for his standing as a public man and a gentleman.

Mr. Bartlett was at one time a member of the City Hall Commission of San Francisco, and we believe he held at the same time the position of Mayor. At this time this commission was practically useful solely in the matter of dispensing salaries may be seen from the fact that during the entire year \$48,000 was paid out for work on the building and \$4,700.00 was paid as salaries. That Mr. Bartlett as a member of that commission drew this unearned salary up to late date as January last is an undisputed fact. Yet Mr. Bartlett was legally entitled to this salary, and while it furnishes legitimate ground for criticism, it does not furnish grounds for abusing him as a thief, or for saying that the act was necessarily that of an utterly disreputable man. We do not think he was justified in drawing a salary without having rendered an equivalent for it, but Mr. Bartlett may look at the matter in another light.

John F. Swift has also been employed to transact business for the City of San Francisco. He was given a contract by the Board of Supervisors to conduct a case against the Spring Valley Water Company. The terms of the contract were that if he did not win the case, he was to receive nothing for his work. He fought the case in the courts for seven years, and when the Legislature legalized the payment of his fee by the city a Democrat had now taken it. They have represented their situation to the railroad company, and according to the Chronicle, that corporation has under consideration a plan to abolish all terminal shipping points except San Francisco and Los Angeles. Past experience certainly did not justify us in expecting anything of a road or liberal character from the men who will propose this, but we were hardly prepared for an action so shameful and contemptible as this. There are now but seven terminal points in the state, which are a number less than the business interests of the state demand, and a proposition that this number, in addition to a few small-minded and cowardly tradesmen, be decreased to two, is beyond all precedent for wanton impiety in the history of any country. We do not know what sort of a railroad company, but we do know that if either the railroad company or the promoters of this movement have the slightest regard for public opinion there will be no attempt made to carry out this repulsive and illegitimate undertaking.

LET US HEAR FROM HIM.

The people of Fresno county want to hear from Washington Bartlett on the irrigation question. That no mention of this most important of all matters now before the people should fall from the lips of the man who aspires to be Governor of the state for the first four years, during which time this question must come up for settlement, is too ominous to be passed by unnoticed by a people whose existence is at stake. The time of election is near at hand, and the people have a right to demand that if Mr. Bartlett has any ideas upon the question that they be made public.

IRRIGATION AND CANDIDATES.
John F. Swift says: The natural conditions of California, like those of Spain, require that the waters of her streams be equitably distributed over the land for the purpose of irrigation. THAT THE STATE LAW OF BIAPRARI RIGHTS, OWING TO THESE CONDITIONS, CANNOT APPLY IN CALIFORNIA. That when the Courts decide contrary to the public welfare, that the people can and should remedy the unconstitutional remedy and make the laws as they would have it.

Washington Bartlett says on the irrigation question:

"John F. Swift has the courage and manhood to say that he does not now pretend to be able to frame a law for the settlement of this great question, and that if he had that power he would hesitate to do so until by time and further examination he could resolve what is best for the whole people. Irrigators of Fresno, which do you prefer, the outspoken words of John F. Swift or the silence of Washington Bartlett on the most important question before the people of California?"

John F. Swift has three daily papers and a population of nearly six thousand. It is growing faster than any of the smaller towns in the state.—*San Luis Register*.

Fresno is the place through which the Sacramento and other jealous papers of northern counties say has been developed solely by an influx of immigration, and there are no substantial resources to back it up. The statement, however, is a plain falsehood to say to those who have any knowledge of the real conditions, is an infamous falsehood. There is no industry in the state to day enjoying more rapid prosperity from its own resources than Fresno, and the growth of the town in the state has been more wealthy or more in keeping with the advancement of the surrounding country than has the town of Fresno. This sort of malicious warfare on one section upon another is calculated to injure the entire community who indulge in it.

Hicks & Barrett.

Now comes and sooner, to be had from Markwell, the jeweler.

A New Firm.

The firm of Hicks & Barrett is now consolidated with the Fresno Hardware Co., and would be pleased to see their old friends at the new stand in Tenants' building, next door to the Opera House. A full stock of hardware, stoves, pumps, wagons, furniture, etc. A specialty made of plumbing and its works.

Hicks & Barrett.

New goods and new prices.

Every Oliver Chilled Plow sold by us is warranted to do good work. We have a full stock of plows and extra.

Kirkpatrick, Goldsmith & Co.

Snuff and cigarettes to suit all nights at Markwell's, optician.

To Kent. From six to ten thousand acres of good farming land within five miles of Fresno. Apply to Faymonville & Mariposa St., off Mariposa St., Off Mariposa.

J. L. LEWISON & CO., the leaders in love.

Go to the leaders for your clothing and furnishings goods. They have the finest assortment ever exhibited in Fresno, and their prices are lower than the lowest.

J. L. LEWISON & CO., the leaders in love.

Attention of our readers is directed to a card elsewhere in this paper from J. M. and Chas. E. Swift, half-brothers of Hon. John F. Swift, in which they uniformly refuse a slander repeated by four-fifths of the Democratic papers of this state. Will these same papers now repeat this refutation of the baseless charges they have unjustly heaped upon the good name of so honorable a brother?

With the Fresno Democrat stop it.

John F. Swift just long enough to tell us what Washington Bartlett's views on the irrigation question are.

Before that Mr. Bartlett endorses the Democratic platform will not do.

Mr. Bartlett himself are

ORDINANCE NO. 16.

An ordinance fixing the rates of county tax levied for the collection of the taxes.

The Board of Supervisors of Fresno County do hereby ordain:

Section 1. A license must be procured annually before the commencement of any business, trade or occupation in the city of Fresno, or in any part of the county, which license authorizes the party obtaining the same to transact business described in such license. Such license must be obtained for each branch of business.

Section 2. The amount to be paid for a license is as follows:

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$100 and less than \$200, \$10.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$200 and less than \$300, \$15.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$300 and less than \$400, \$20.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$400 and less than \$500, \$25.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$500 and less than \$600, \$30.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$600 and less than \$700, \$35.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$700 and less than \$800, \$40.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$800 and less than \$900, \$45.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$900 and less than \$1000, \$50.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$1000 and less than \$1200, \$55.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$1200 and less than \$1400, \$60.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$1400 and less than \$1600, \$65.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$1600 and less than \$1800, \$70.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$1800 and less than \$2000, \$75.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$2000 and less than \$2200, \$80.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$2200 and less than \$2400, \$85.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$2400 and less than \$2600, \$90.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$2600 and less than \$2800, \$95.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$2800 and less than \$3000, \$100.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$3000 and less than \$3200, \$105.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$3200 and less than \$3400, \$110.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$3400 and less than \$3600, \$115.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$3600 and less than \$3800, \$120.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$3800 and less than \$4000, \$125.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$4000 and less than \$4200, \$130.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$4200 and less than \$4400, \$135.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$4400 and less than \$4600, \$140.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$4600 and less than \$4800, \$145.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$4800 and less than \$5000, \$150.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$5000 and less than \$5200, \$155.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$5200 and less than \$5400, \$160.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$5400 and less than \$5600, \$165.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$5600 and less than \$5800, \$170.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$5800 and less than \$6000, \$175.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$6000 and less than \$6200, \$180.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$6200 and less than \$6400, \$185.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$6400 and less than \$6600, \$190.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$6600 and less than \$6800, \$195.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$6800 and less than \$7000, \$200.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$7000 and less than \$7200, \$205.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$7200 and less than \$7400, \$210.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$7400 and less than \$7600, \$215.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$7600 and less than \$7800, \$220.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$7800 and less than \$8000, \$225.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$8000 and less than \$8200, \$230.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$8200 and less than \$8400, \$235.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$8400 and less than \$8600, \$238.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$8600 and less than \$8800, \$240.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$8800 and less than \$9000, \$245.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$9000 and less than \$9200, \$250.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$9200 and less than \$9400, \$255.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$9400 and less than \$9600, \$260.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$9600 and less than \$9800, \$265.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$9800 and less than \$10000, \$270.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$10000 and less than \$10200, \$275.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$10200 and less than \$10400, \$280.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$10400 and less than \$10600, \$285.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$10600 and less than \$10800, \$290.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$10800 and less than \$11000, \$295.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$11000 and less than \$11200, \$300.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$11200 and less than \$11400, \$305.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$11400 and less than \$11600, \$310.

Class.—The whose monthly average amount to \$11600 and less than \$

